

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15 and 17-22 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 13 and 19-22 are amended and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity, and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; b) do not raise any new reasons that require further search and/or consideration; and c) place the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments incorporate the previously claimed subject matter regarding the first and second information into the independent claims. No new issues are raised. Entry is therefore proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 11, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. While not specifically addressed, it appears that the Office Action is referencing the amendments to “last portion.” Accordingly, the proposed Amendment amends claims 1, 4, 11, 13 and 19 back to the previously recited features of “end portion.” These amendments should be entered since they relate to previously claimed subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 6, 8-9, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,597,918 to Kim. The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 4, 7, 11-15, 17-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kim and U.S. Patent 5,673,259 to Quick, Jr. (hereafter Quick).

Still further, the Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kim and U.S. Patent 6,208,859 to Halvorson. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites that the connection information comprises first connection information for informing there is a respective divided text message connected to a rear of the first connection information, and second connection information for informing there is the respective divided text message connected to a front of the second connection information. Independent claim 1 also recites the first connection information also for informing a connection with another one of the divided text messages and the second connection information also for informing a connection with a further one of the divided text messages.

Kim and Quick do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action agrees (on page 6, lines 2-6) that Kim does not disclose first connection information for informing that there is divided text message connected in rear of the connection information and second connection information for informing that there is divided text message connected in front of the connection information.

The Office Action relies on Quick's Figure 8 and col. 14, lines 48-67 for showing the claimed first and second connection information. In particular, the Office Action references Quick's flag octets 802 and 810. However, Quick's flags 802 and 810 are not connection information. Rather, as is well known in High Level Data Link Control (HDLC), frames are delineated by a sequence of bits known as a flag. The flag sequences a unique bit sequence in the form of "01111110" for example. Thus, the flags 802 and 810 do not correspond to the claimed first and second connection information. Furthermore, the flags do not correspond to

the claimed first connection information also for informing a connection with another one of the divided text message and second connection information also for informing a connection with a further one of the divided text messages. That is, Quick's flags 802 and 810 do not relate to connections with other divided text messages. Accordingly, Kim and Quick may not be combined as alleged in the Office Action to reach the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Each of the other independent claims 6, 11, 13 and 19 also define patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons by reciting identical and/or similar subject matter of varying scope. Also, for clarification, independent claim 19 recites inserting a start connection code at a start position of the respective divided message to indicate a start of the respective divided message and that a further divided message precedes the respective divided message. For at least similar reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims also recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-4, 6-15 and 17-22 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/987,100
Reply to Office Action dated July 1, 2005

Docket No. K-0337

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/krf

Date: September 30, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610